	Case 2:06-cv-01125-TSZ Document 13 Filed 09/26/06 Page 1 of 3
01	
02	
03	
04	
05	
06	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
07	AT SEATTLE
08	MARK C. CHRISTENSON,) CASE NO.: C06-1125-MJP
09	Plaintiff,)
10	v.) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
11	SAFEWAY FOOD AND DRUG,
12	Defendant.)
13	,
14	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY CONCLUSION
15	Plaintiff Mark C. Christenson submitted an <i>in forma pauperis</i> (IFP) application, but failed
16	to include a Written Consent for Payment of Costs form. (Dkt. 1.) Plaintiff included with his
17	application a one-page "Complaint" listing the terms "Theft," "Negligence," and "Slander" in the
18	caption. (Id.) The complaint contained no further information regarding plaintiff's claims. Nor
19	did it provide a request for relief or basis for jurisdiction in this Court. Plaintiff also submitted a
20	letter noting that "appellate actions have been appealed[]" and stating: "Your eastern sister tells
21	me of agreement on forms between the courts. As I am want of your anchor's handiwork please
22	accept the filled out photostatic forms headed with the courts moniker for your record." (Id.)
	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION PAGE -1

The Court issued a Minute Order directing plaintiff to submit a signed Written Consent for Payment of Costs form within thirty days. (Dkt. 2.) The Court also advised plaintiff to submit a revised complaint addressing the basis for jurisdiction and venue in this Court and providing sufficient detail regarding his claims. (*Id.*)

Plaintiff submitted a number of documents following the issuance of the Minute Order. (*See* Dkts. 3, 5-11.) None of those submissions included a Written Consent for Payment of Costs form, a revised complaint, or any further detail regarding plaintiff's claims or the basis for jurisdiction in this Court. Instead, like the proposed complaint, the various documents submitted by plaintiff lack substance: "Emblazonment[:] Appeal prosecution forbids my communication with this court as regards this action[.]" (Dkt. 5); stating "Objecta restated" and listing complaints about an "Unanswered petition for writ[.]" (Dkt. 6.)

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court may deny an application to proceed IFP and should dismiss an action if, among other things, it is frivolous or the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(ii); *O'Loughlin v. Doe*, 920 F.2d 614, 616 (9th Cir. 1990). An action is frivolous if "it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

Here, plaintiff fails to allege any facts to place defendant on notice of the nature of his claims, to request any relief, or to provide any basis for jurisdiction in this Court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Because this action appears frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, it is subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).

It should also be noted that two other actions simultaneously filed by plaintiff in this Court

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

PAGE -2

have been deemed frivolous. See Christenson v. Municipal Court of Seattle, No. C06-1124JLR (Dkt. 10) and Christenson v. Washington State Supreme Court, No. C06-5454RBL (Dkt. 6). The Court advises plaintiff of his responsibility to research the facts and law before filing an action to 04 determine whether his action is frivolous. If he files a frivolous action, he may be sanctioned See Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. The court would likely impose a sanction of dismissal on any frivolous action. 06 If plaintiff files numerous frivolous or malicious actions, the court may bar him from proceeding IFP in this court. See DeLong v. Hennessey, 912 F.2d 1144, 1146-48 (9th Cir. 1990) (discussing bar order requirements).

Accordingly, because of the deficiencies in plaintiff's IFP application and complaint, his request to proceed IFP should be denied and this action dismissed without prejudice. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). A proposed Order of Dismissal accompanies this Report and Recommendation.

DATED this 26th day of September, 2006.

United States Magistrate Judge

16 17

02

03

08

09

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION PAGE -3